

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/010,850	12/05/2001	Peggy J. Clews	SD6957S97604	7432
7590 06/03/2004			EXAMINER	
Sandia National Laboratories			TRAN, E	SINH X
P. O. Box 5800 - MS-0161 Albuquerque, NM 87185-0161			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Modulique, Min 57105 5101			1765	

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/010,850	CLEWS ET AL.	9	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Binh X Tran	1765		

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 24 May 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

Examina	ation (RCE) in compliance with 37 Cr R 1.114.	
	PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)	]
b) 🗌	The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set for event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS 706.07(f).	date of the final rejection.
Extens have been f 37 CFR 1.1 (b) above, if	rocks (1).  The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amour .17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the function adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	nt of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under y set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
1.□ A 37	Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within 7 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dism	n the period set forth in issal of the appeal.
2. Th	he proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:	
(a) ∑	★ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or se      ★ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or se      ★ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or se      ★ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or se      ★ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or se      ★ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or se      ★ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or se      ★ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or se      ★ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or se      ★ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and they raise new issues that they raise new issues they raise new issues that they raise new issues they raise new issues that they raise new issues they raise new issues that they raise new issues they raise new issues that they raise new issues the raise new issues that they raise new issues that they raise new issues that they raise new issues the raise new issues new is	arch (see NOTE below);
(b) [	they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);	
(c) [	they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal b issues for appeal; and/or	y materially reducing or simplifying the
(d) [	they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number	per of finally rejected claims.
	NOTE: See Continuation Sheet	
	applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	
	lewly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	in a separate, timely filed amendment
	The a) $\square$ affidavit, b) $\square$ exhibit, or c) $\boxtimes$ request for reconsideration has bee application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.	n considered but does NOT place the
	The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SC raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	DLELY to issues which were newly
7.⊠ Fo	For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) $\boxtimes$ will not be enterestylanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provide	ed or b)⊡ will be entered and an ed below or appended.
Th	The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	
С	Claim(s) allowed:	
	Claim(s) objected to:	
С	Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 and 4-9</u> .	
С	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
8 Tf	The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapprov	red by the Examiner.
9. No	Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)
10. O	Other:	
	s en	NADINE G. NORTON UPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
		MM 2

110/010,850

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The new limitation "while retaining the patterned layers of polysilicon and the metal layer including aluminum" raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicants' argument, "one skill in the art would not be motivated to utilize an etching solution containing H2SO4 and HF ...since there would be no way to know whether or not the aluminum would be retained or attacked by the H2SO4" related to the new issues added by applicants. This new issues would require further consideration and/or search. The applicants further argue that the 0-140 °C in Liaw is a typographical mistake for 100-140 °C since in col. 2 lines 48-49 Liaw states "temperature 100-140 °C, preferably 120 °C". The examiner disagrees. The examiner acknowledges that Liaw does disclose the temperature of 100-140 °C as point out by applicants. However, Liaw also discloses the temperature from 0 to 140 °C. The examiner interprets the prior arts under "as is" condition and will not assume that there is a typographical error in Liaw suggested by applicants.

Binh X. Tran